

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,755 to Lemmons et al. ("*Lemmons*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0026637 to Markel et al. ("*Markel*").

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, and 7, and claims 1-8 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The prior art cited by the Examiner, *Lemmons* and *Markel*, does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-8. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 1 recites an electronic equipment comprising, for example:

script text acquisition means for acquiring one or more script texts, containing at least a media element identification of said visual media information to be input from one of said interfaces, an external source information of the media element, and a display layout of said media element on said display screen, and an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces;

(emphasis added). *Lemmons* and *Markel*, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention.

Lemmons discloses "providing an interactive program guide system that has program guide display screen look and functionality assigned or updated using markup language documents" (col. 1, lines 54-56). The markup language documents in *Lemmons* only generate the display elements in a display screen (i.e. display screen 50). The Examiner continue to assert, "the script text as shown in Fig. 7a, 7b contains

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

at least a media element identification such as display elements 1-3 and a display layout of the media element” (Office Action at page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Display elements 1-3 (ref. 314 in Fig. 7a) appear to refer to the type and location of the elements that are displayed on screen 50. These elements are used solely for the generation of the desired display on screen 50. Therefore, even assuming that markup language documents constitute the claimed “script texts,” which Applicant does not concede, the markup language documents are only used to generate the display on display screen 50.

As previously stated, display elements 1-3 refer to the visual location of the program listings grid, text, and video (see Fig. 7a). Even though a program may be viewed by selecting the appropriate option on screen 50, Applicant submits that the markup language documents only contain information regarding the display of screen 50 and do not contain “media element identification of said visual media information to be input from one of said interfaces.”

In addition to the above deficiencies, the markup language documents in *Lemmons* do not contain “an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces.” Therefore, *Lemmons* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, a script text acquisition means for acquiring one or more script texts, containing at least “a media element identification of said visual media information to be input from one of said interfaces,” and “an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner correctly states that *Lemmons* “does not expressly teach that the script text contains an external source information of the media element” (Office Action at page 4). However, the Examiner relies on *Markel* for allegedly disclosing this element. Even assuming that this assertion is correct, which Applicant does not concede, *Markel* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lemmons*.

Markel discloses “a software emulation program that allows a personal computer to emulate the functions of various set-top boxes” (paragraph 0009). Fig. 7 of *Markel* discloses a program listing of an XML script. Within the page, an element’s name is declared at step 708, the graphic source is declared at step 710, and the position of the graphic is provided at steps 712 and 714.

Markel discloses the graphic source. However, *Markel* does not disclose the claimed “indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces.” Therefore, *Markel* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, a script text acquisition means for acquiring one or more script texts, containing at least “an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Lemmons* and *Markel* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-4 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1. Independent claims 5 and 7 and dependent claims 6 and 8, while of different scope, are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance, and Applicant requests a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 15, 2007

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220